

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. The Applicant has carefully considered the official communication dated April 13, 2007. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment and the following remarks are fully responsive to the official communication.
2. The claims have been amended in light of the official communication. It is submitted that no new matter has been added as a result of the amendment.
3. Claim 1 has been amended to replace printer means with printhead. Also, the word “expansive” and the words “which is at least the same size as said printed image” have been deleted. In claim 1, as amended, the magnetic recording means is described as a photo width magnetic recording head. Basis for that amendment is found in Figure 2 of the drawings as filed. Reference numeral 16 refers to a magnetic recording head. It is clearly shown as being of photo width. Also, in the first paragraph of the description of the preferred embodiment there is set out that the “Artcam device is altered so as to include a magnetic recording device which can comprise an array of magnetic recorders covering a whole surface of the photograph ...”
4. In paragraph 2 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a). It is respectfully submitted that claim 1, as amended, no longer describes material not shown in the drawings.
5. In paragraph 3 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner has pointed out an informality relating to antecedence. Claim 1, as amended, no longer contains that informality.
6. In paragraph 5 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1 to 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki (US 5,847,836) in view of Hatada et al (US 4,270,853), Sharma (US 5,726,693) and Robison (US 5,194,892).
7. The Examiner has stated that Suzuki discloses a “print head (5)”. Claim 1, as amended, however, discloses a “photo width ink jet printhead” It is respectfully submitted that the print head of Suzuki is not a photo width printhead. Rather, it is a print head that scans the print media while printing. A person of ordinary skill in the art will readily appreciate that scanning printheads are significantly different to photo width or pagewidth printheads. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that Suzuki is not relevant in the light of claim 1, as amended.
8. In the Detailed Action, the Examiner has stated that Hatada et al discloses “a camera system with a sensor for sensing an image and printing the sensed image where there is a first surface for the printing (sic) the image (2) and a second surface...”. Applicant respectfully submits that the printing in Hatada et al is of the type where the photograph is developed in the camera (e.g. the Polaroid TM cameras). See for example column 2, lines 14 to 20 of Hatada et al. Thus, Hatada et al does not disclose a photo width ink jet printhead.

9. It is thus respectfully submitted that no combination of Suzuki and Hatada et al can provide a camera system with a photo width inkjet printhead as set out in claim 1, as amended. Furthermore, neither Suzuki nor Hatada et al disclose a "photo width magnetic recording head" as set out in claim 1, as amended. Hatada et al discloses a recording head that sweeps the magnetic sound recording band as described in column 5, lines 5 to 7.
10. The Examiner has stated that Sharma et al discloses in Fig. 1, a photo width ink jet printing (sic). However, Applicant respectfully submits that Sharma et al does not disclose a "photo width magnetic recording head". Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that no combination of Suzuki, Hatada et al and Sharma et al can provide a camera system with a photo width inkjet printhead.
11. The Examiner has stated that Robison discloses "a photo media being treated to include an expansive magnetic recording surface the same size as the image". However, Applicant respectfully submits that Robison does not disclose a "photo width magnetic recording head". Rather, Robison describes a "photofinisher head" for reading magnetic tracks. In column 9, lines 35 to 37 there is set out that: "Note in FIG. 4 that the photofinisher head, which must read the camera tracks, does not leave the camera track because it has a much smaller width." The camera tracks are logically of smaller width than the film itself. It follows that the photofinisher head is significantly narrower than the film. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that no combination of Suzuki, Hatada et al, Sharma et al and Robison can provide a camera system with a photo width inkjet printhead.
12. In view of the above paragraphs, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not obvious in the light of Suzuki, Hatada et al, Sharma et al and Robison as alleged by the Examiner. The respectful submission is apposite to claims 2 to 5, as they depend upon claim 1.
13. In paragraph 6 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1 to 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Kelley (US 4,905,029), Sharma et al and Robison.
14. Applicant has responded to the citations of Suzuki, Sharma et al and Robison in the above paragraphs. Those paragraphs are apposite. Kelley does not disclose a "photo width magnetic recording head". Rather, as is clear from the drawings of Kelley, the recording transducer 78 is both significantly narrower than, and offset from, the photographic recording medium 22. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that no combination of Suzuki, Kelley, Sharma et al and Robison can provide a camera system with a photo width inkjet printhead.
15. In view of the above paragraphs, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not obvious in the light of Suzuki, Kelley, Sharma et al and Robison as alleged by the Examiner. The respectful submission is apposite to claims 2 to 5, as they depend upon claim 1.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application are courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



Kia Silverbrook

C/o:

Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email:

kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone:

+612 9818 6633

Facsimile:

+61 2 9555 7762